

## REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the final Office Action mailed January 24, 2006 (Paper No./Date 20060119). Reconsideration and allowance of the Application and present claims are respectfully requested.

### I. Interview Summary

Applicants first wish to express their sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Annan Q. Shang spent with Applicants' Representative, Minh Nguyen, during a telephone discussion on April 18, 2006 regarding the then outstanding final Office Action. The discussion focused on the final Office Action and claim 1 of the present application. Applicants submit that the amendments made in claims 1 and 31 of this response to Final Office Action was an agreed suggestion by both the Examiner and Applicants' Representative. The Examiner indicated that the amendment may overcome the cited references depending on the results of a new search.

### II. Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claims 1-8, 15-37, and 42-62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,635,989 to *Rothmuller* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,005,565 to *Legall, et al.* Claims 9-14 and 39-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Rothmuller* in view of *Legall* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,268,849 to *Boyer, et al.*

In order for a claim to be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, the teachings of the prior art reference must suggest all steps/elements/features of the claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. *See, e.g., In re Dow Chemical*, 837 F.2d 469, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 U.S.P.Q. 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

#### A. Claims 1 and 31

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A programmable television services client device for enabling a user to search for television program information, said client device comprising:

memory for storing a first data including respective program information corresponding to a plurality of television programs, said respective program information including a first program parameter;

display configuration information contained in said memory that includes a guide arrangement for an interactive program guide (IPG), wherein said guide arrangement is configured to provide a user-selectable search option for television programs in the first data; and

a processor configured to,

provide the IPG with a first portion of the first data, said first portion including program information for respective television programs according to the initial guide arrangement, ***said first portion including a channel area and a program display area, said program display area including television program titles corresponding to the television programs and time periods that are assigned to the television program titles,***

provide the user-selectable search option having browse-by formats of title, theme, time and character word or sequence search responsive to the user selecting the user-selectable search option, ***the user-selectable search option being displayed in the channel area,***

provide a guide arrangement in the character word or sequence search format responsive to the user selecting the search format from the user-selectable search option,

receive a text string from the user by way of the guide arrangement in the character word or sequence search format, said text string being input by the user, said text string corresponding to the first program parameter,

search the first data in said memory for television programs corresponding to the received text string, and

responsive to searching the first data in said memory, provide a displayed search result comprising the IPG with a second portion of the first data, said second portion including program information for at least a portion of the corresponding television programs resulting from the search.

(Emphasis Added)

32. A method for implementing a programmable television services client device to enable a user to search for television program information, said method for implementing a programmable television services client device comprising the steps of:

receiving in the client device from a server device a first data including respective program information corresponding to a plurality of scheduled television programs;

storing the first data in a memory of the client device;

providing an IPG with a user-selectable search option for television programs in the first data, the user-selectable search option having browse-by formats of title theme, time, and a character word or sequence search; ***said IPG including a channel area and a program display area, said program display area including television program titles corresponding to the television programs and time periods that are assigned to the television program titles,*** responsive to the user selecting the character word or sequence search format of the user-selectable search option, ***displaying the user-selectable search option in the channel area,*** providing a guide arrangement in the character word or sequence search format, implementing a search for television programs in the first data stored in said memory of the client corresponding to a text string received from the user by way of the guide arrangement in the character word or sequence search format, said search being limited according to a user-selected time period to television programs corresponding to the user-selected time period, wherein the user-selected time period is selected by the user from a plurality of user-selected time periods; and responsive to implementing the search, providing a displayed search result in the IPG comprising program information from said first data corresponding to at least a portion of the television programs resulting from the search.

(Emphasis Added)

Applicants respectfully submit that *Rothmuller* in view of *Legall* fails to disclose, teach or suggest the above-emphasized feature as recited in claims 1 and 31. As mentioned above in the Interview Summary, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments made in claims 1 and 31 of this response to Final Office Action was an agreed suggestion by both the Examiner and Applicants' Representative. The Examiner indicated that the amendment may be allowable depending on the results of a new search. Consequently, for at least this reason, among others, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and if Examiner does not find any references in the new search, Applicants respectfully request that claims 1 and 31 be allowed.

B. Dependent claims 2-30 and 32-62

Because independent claims 1 and 31 are allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 2-30 and 32-62 are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 2-30 and 32-62 contain all features and elements of their respective independent base claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Accordingly, the rejection to dependent claims 2-30 and 32-62 should be withdrawn for at least this reason, among others.

### **CONCLUSION**

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

Applicants respectfully maintain that the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any comments or suggestions that would place the subject patent application in better condition for allowance, she is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER  
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**



---

**Jeffrey R. Kuester, Reg. No. 34,367  
Attorney for Applicants**

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP  
100 Galleria Parkway, NW  
Atlanta, GA 30339  
Ph: (770) 933 - 9500  
Fax: (770) 951 - 0933